

Date: Sun, 2 May 93 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #124  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 2 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 124

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Sat, 1 May 1993 18:17:44 GMT  
From: usc!wupost!emory!wa4mei!kd4nc!n4tii@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp>, <oowP3B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us>,  
<1993Apr30.220650.171705@locus.com>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <oowP3B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:  
>>If you're  
>>in contact with a ham who is also a MARS operator and you wish to move the  
>>contact over to MARS frequencies, you'll need to come up with something  
>>other than that designator to indicate \_which\_ frequency you're moving to.

>Just changing designator is not sufficient if the intent is still to encode  
>the "secret" frequency on the air so that others cannot understand the  
>meaning. I would suggest, in this situation, if the MARS ops wish to  
>communicate the frequency, they would need to use an alternative comms  
>service, such as the telephone, to express this.

>If you want to communicate on ham radio, you have to use clear text.

>That doesn't mean you cannot arrange with someone to speak in private.

Oh come on, Dana....

Let's change the scenario here...let's say I want my buddy to call me on the phone at work.... I say "Call me at my work number." Since I didn't exactly tell everyone what my work number is, or told people where I worked, then I've just encrypted that transmission and I'm guilty....

I don't care....let someone pink slip me ... If I'm down here talking to my friend Eddie, who's Army MARS, and I tell him "Go to MARS PACKET" then that is not a cipher...I don't have to tell him and the whole repeater where I'm going....one, it's none of their business.... I CAN be secret if I want to....you probably bitch and moan about the guy that uses the cover tone on the autopatch...and then you only hear one side of the conversation.

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

73 de john

>--

> \* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are

\*

> \* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily

\*

> \* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

\*

> \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

Date: Sat, 1 May 1993 20:43:06 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,

<930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,

<1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>

Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) writes:

>>From what I understand MARS doesn't operate under Amateur, ie Part 97

>>regulations, so why would it be a problem for them to obscure the

>>meaning?

>

>Because the discussion Dana relates was taking place not on MARS

>channels, but on regular amateur frequencies. On THOSE, it's illegal

>to use codes to obscure meanings.

>

> - Brian

Reread the article, Brian; the MARS operator was talking ABOUT the designators being used, not USING the designators in place of frequencies. A small, but important point.

NH6IL

-----

Date: Sun, 02 May 93 01:28:53 GMT

From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1roojaINN9gs@zephyr.ens.tek.com>, <C695qC.D3A@odin.corp.sgi.com>,  
<1993Apr29.225304.6651@kd4nc.uucp>and

Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr29.225304.6651@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:

>jerryb@jerber.sandiego.sgi.com (Jerry Bransford) writes:

>

>>In article <1roojaINN9gs@zephyr.ens.tek.com>, ronk@cascade.ens.tek.com (Ron  
>>Kirkpatrick) writes:

>>|> Ok, so they didn't tell you the frequency they were talking about. Does

>>|> that

>>|> mean that anytime someone gets on the ham frequencies and says:

>>|>

>>|> "Let's go to xyz repeater." or

>>|> "Let's go simplex." or

>>|> "I'll meet you on channel 16." (Marine or CB) or

>>|> "I'll meet you at the usual stop." (Time to eat.)

>>|> (Ok, so I'm getting a little far a field here. I'm just trying to

>>|> make a

>>|> point.)

>>|>

>>|> They are talking in 'code'? NO WAY!

>>|>

>>|> Now let's get on with life.

>>|>

>>|> --

>>|> Ron Kirkpatrick N7RFA/BF151/AFA5HZ (HAM/CAP/MARS)

>>|> News Administrator/Postmaster

>>|> Tektronix, Inc

>>|> 503-627-6707

>

>>Right on!! To those who CAN'T STAND not knowing all the CAP/MARS, etc  
>>frequencies, CTCSS tones, etc. etc. GET A LIFE!!  
>  
>  
>Really... it's not as big a deal as it seems...a code or cipher meant  
>to OBSCURE MEANING is what aprt 97 is about... ther codes for freq designators  
>on MARS I think are to make freq. mangement better...not to obscure....  
>Plus...I think that national security and what not fall in there...  
>  
>Some people like stirring up stuff that really don't need to be stirred up.  
>  
>Example of a code or cipher meant to obscure meaning: The cow is in the chair.  
>Meaning: Honey, I'm home! That's a CODE or CIPHER....  
>

The discussion in question started when a MARS op said "We use designators on ham frequencies so people won't know what frequencies we are using".

This is obscuring meaning, plain and simple.

>Oh well..enough of my nonsense.

Indeed.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Sun, 02 May 93 01:26:26 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp>,  
<1993Apr28.154905.107732@locus.com>, <1993Apr29.224329.4606@kd4nc.uucp>.loc  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr29.224329.4606@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:  
>dana@atlas.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>  
>>In article <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed)  
writes:  
>>>

>>>Sorry, I don't know this editor that well.....anyway...I'm in Air Force  
>>>MARS and no we do not discuss radio frequencies on the air. We refer to  
>>>all the frequencies in the form of a designator.  
>>>The reason why we do this is for national security. And, yes, it is to  
>>>obscure the meaning of the transmission...the casual listener does not  
>>>need to know everything MARS does. In the interest of national security,  
>>>in time of war or something, if sensitive traffic was being routed thru  
>>>MARS, we don't want "Charlie" following us across the band.  
>  
>  
>>Part 97 prohibits the use of codes and ciphers to obscure the meaning  
>>of transmissions on amateur frequencies. If hams who happen to be MARS  
>>operators are using amateur frequencies, they must abide by the amateur  
>>rules in Part 97. This means that the use of designators to obscure  
>>the meaning of your messages is clearly illegal. What MARS ops do on  
>>non-amateur frequencies is not an issue.  
>  
>You are correct....but MARS operations on MARS freqs do NOT come over part  
>97.....so Part 97 has no force outside the ham bands... However, I do not  
>see violation at all if I am on Ham bands and I tell my MARS buddy to go  
>to MARS FM or go over to 2s1 a minute.... 2s1 (in SE USA) is what the  
>net is called.... the freq designator is something else... but I am not  
>discouraging or ciphering my transmissions when I move him there...  
>When I say, "Go to 2s1, Joe" that is not a cipher.... Also, when I tell  
>my buddy to "Go over to the CAP repeater" it is not a cipher... I don't  
>have to say "Go over to 148.150" or something.... It is not meant to  
>"obscure" the meaning.... when you are watching tv and want to tell a  
>man on the radio to look at a certain station do you tell him to "Go to  
>54 Mhz VSB 4.5 Mhz audio subcarrier!" or do you tell him to go to TV CH2?  
>  
>It makes perfect sense...  
>  
>This argument is useless....MARS is not a part 97 discussion...MARS is MARS.  
>

Stop being so dense; the discussion referred to the use of ciphers by  
MARS ops on amateur frequencies.

Sheesh. Are all MARS ops incapable of sentient thought?

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #124

\*\*\*\*\*